



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,182	06/30/2003	Dennis K. Killinger	1372.08.PRWOUS	1181
21901	7590	06/12/2008	EXAMINER	
SMITH HOPEN, PA 180 PINE AVENUE NORTH OLDSMAR, FL 34677			BELLO, AGUSTIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/604,182	Applicant(s) KILLINGER, DENNIS K.	
	Examiner Agustin Bello	Art Unit 2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,12-27,30-33 and 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,18-27,30-33 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/28/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 6, 18-27, 30-33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rees (Patent No. US 6,034,760 A).

Regarding claim 1, Rees teaches at least one laser (reference numeral 12 in Figure 3) adapted to generate coherent light simultaneously at multiple wavelengths (i.e. 16a, 34a, 16b, 34b, 16c, 36c in Figure 3); said receiver including at least one detector (reference numeral 87, 96, 98, 100 in Figure 3) adapted to detect said coherent light at multiple wavelengths; said at least one laser and said at least one receiver not being positioned in line-of-sight relation to one another (as seen in Figure 3 where receiver 87 lies on a different plane than laser 12), a plurality of external remote targets and target spatial regions fixed in line-of-sight relation to said laser and in line-of-sight relation to said detector (as seen in Figure 1); said external remote targets and

Art Unit: 2613

target spatial regions including trees, buildings, clouds, atmospheric aerosols, and like objects that are out-of-doors relative to said laser (as seen in Figure 1); a modulating device (reference numeral 24 in Figure 3) connected in modulating relation to said optical light laser; said modulating device adapted to modulate each of said multiple wavelengths (i.e. 16a, 16b, 16c in Figure 3) so that multiple messages are transmitted simultaneously; said communication device adapted to aim said modulated light from said at least one laser at said plurality of external remote targets and target spatial regions to separate spatially different communication optical signals from one another (reference numeral 16 in Figure 1); said at least one detector adapted to demodulate light scattered by said target (reference numeral 96 in Figure 3); said at least one detector including an optical bandpass filter (reference numeral 91 in Figure 3) adapted to pass preselected wavelengths of light and reject wavelengths of light outside of said preselected wavelengths; whereby multiple messages are simultaneously transmitted along multiple wavelengths (16b, 16c in Figure 3); and whereby said multiple messages are individually detected by said at least one detector (reference numeral 87 in Figure 3).

Regarding claims 6, 18, and 19, Rees teaches a first data communication device (reference numeral 12, 24, 38 in Figure 3) adapted to transmit multiple sets of data through multiple wavelengths (i.e. 16a, 16b, 16c in Figure 3), there being as many wavelengths as there are sets of data (i.e. each wavelength carries a data set); a laser source (reference numeral 12 in Figure 3) modulated by said first data communication device; a transmitter telescope (reference numeral 74 in Figure 3) adapted to aim modulated light of said multiple wavelengths from said laser source to a plurality of light-reflecting multiple external remote targets (reference numeral 16 in Figure 1); said plurality of light-reflecting multiple external remote targets including trees,

buildings, clouds, atmospheric aerosols, and like objects that are out-of-doors relative to said first data communication device (i.e. all of the out-of-doors elements seen in Figure 1); a second data communication device (reference numeral 87, 96, 98, 100, 104, 108, 112 in Figure 3) adapted to receive multiple sets of data carried by said multiple wavelengths (i.e. 16a, 16b, 16c in Figure 3); said first and second data communication devices not being positioned in line-of-sight relation to one another (as seen in Figure 3 where receiver 87 lies on a different plane than laser 12), an optical detector (reference numeral 92 in Figure 3) connected in driving relation to said second data communication device, said optical detector adapted to generate electrical signals corresponding to detected optical signals; a receiving telescope (reference numeral 74 in Figure 3) adapted to collect modulated light reflected from said plurality of light-reflecting external remote targets at said multiple wavelengths and to deliver said modulated light to said optical detector; an optical bandpass filter (reference numeral 91 in Figure 3) connected between said receiving telescope and said optical detector; a barrier means (reference numeral 70 in Figure 3) adapted to be positioned between said first and second data communication devices, said barrier means preventing line-of-sight communication between said first and second data communication devices; said communication device being adapted to aim said modulated light from said laser at said plurality of external remote targets to separate spatially different communication optical signals from one another (reference numeral 16 in Figure 1); said transmitter telescope causing modulated light at multiple wavelengths to reflect from said plurality of light-reflecting different multiple external remote targets (reference numeral 16 in Figure 1); said receiver telescope (reference numeral 74 in Figure 3) causing reflected light at said multiple wavelengths to focus on said optical detector; said second data communication

device receiving electrical signals from said first data communication device (i.e. after reflection by atmosphere and conversion by converter 92 in Figure 3); and said optical bandpass filter (i.e. filter 91 for each of the wavelengths 16a-16c in Figure 3) passing each of said multiple wavelengths to said optical detector so that multiple messages are sent simultaneously from said first data communications device to said second data communications device.

Regarding claim 20, Rees teaches a laser (reference numeral 12 in Figure 3) adapted to generate a LIDAR beam (i.e. a laser beam); a data transmitting device (reference numeral 24 in Figure 3) for modulating said laser; a transmit telescope (reference numeral 74 in Figure 3) adapted to aim said LIDAR beam at a remote target; a receiver telescope (reference numeral 74 in Figure 3) adapted to collect said LIDAR beam after said LIDAR beam has reflected from said remote target; an optical detector means (reference numeral 92 in Figure 3) in communication with said receiver telescope, said optical detector means adapted to generate electrical signals upon receiving reflected light from said receiver telescope; a data receiving device (reference numeral 112 in Figure 3) adapted to receive electrical signals from said optical detector; said data transmitting device and said data receiving device not being positioned in line-of-sight relation to one another (as seen in Figure 3 where receiver 87 lies on a different plane than laser 12), said LIDAR communication system being adapted to aim said modulated light from said LIDAR beam at a plurality of external remote targets and target spatial regions to separate spatially different communication optical signals from one another (reference numeral 16 in Figure 1); said external remote targets and target spatial regions including trees, buildings, clouds, atmospheric aerosols, and like objects that are out-of-doors relative to said laser (i.e. the environment shown in Figure 1); said data receiving device receiving data from said data

Art Unit: 2613

transmitting device even when said data receiving device is positioned in a location distant from said data transmitting device (i.e. the receiver receives continually receives the transmitted light signal) and when at least one obstacle prevents line-of-sight communication between said data transmitting device and said data receiving device (i.e. the objects in the environment that reflect the laser beam).

Regarding claim 21, Rees teaches an electrical signal conditioner (reference numeral 26 in Figure 3) disposed in electrical communication between said data transmitting device and said laser, said electrical signal conditioner adapted to condition signals from said data transmitting device.

Regarding claim 22, Rees teaches an electrical signal conditioner (reference numeral 96, 98, 100, 104, 108 in Figure 3) disposed in electrical communication between said optical detector and said data receiving device, said electrical signal conditioner adapted to condition electrical signals from said optical detector.

Regarding claim 23, Rees teaches an optical bandpass filter (reference numeral 91 in Figure 3) between the receiver telescope and said optical detector (reference numeral 92 in Figure 3).

Regarding claims 24 and 26, Rees teaches multiple optical wavelengths (i.e. 16a-16c in Figure 3) for communication of different communication signals simultaneously when the same external remote target is used as a common target for multiple communication devices.

Regarding claims 25 and 27, Rees teaches multiple optical wavelengths (i.e. 16a-16c in Figure 3) for communication of different communication signals simultaneously when the same

external remote target is used as a common target for LIDAR communication devices (i.e. a laser).

Regarding claims 30, 31, 32, and 33, Rees teaches an optical signal transmitted to a remote external target (reference numeral 16 in Figure 1) wherein the backscattered optical signal is detected simultaneously by multiple telescope receivers positioned at different locations (i.e. as seen in Figure 2 and 3).

Regarding claim 36, Rees teaches the communication device of claim 1, further comprising: a plurality of external remote targets including atmospheric back scatter in non-line-of-sight relation to said detector (i.e. any of the atmospheric backscatter shown in Figure 1 that are non-line-of sight with detector 10 in Figure 1); said detector adapted to detect multipath backscatter from said multiple backscatter spatial target regions (reference numeral 16 in Figure 1; also 16a, 16b, 16c in Figure 3).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 05/28/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

5. Applicant argues that reference numerals 16a-16c do not represent wavelengths. The examiner agrees to some extent and has amended the rejection to include that the laser lights 34a-34c also meet applicant's claim to multiple wavelengths. The examiner further notes that 16a-16c are patches of atmosphere that are formed and probed via the laser light. Therefore, with each patch being formed and probed by laser light, it stands to argue that each of the patches 16 inherently represent wavelengths. Regardless, the claimed multiple wavelengths are at least met by Rees' disclosure of laser outputs 34a-34c.

As to applicant's implication that the claimed multiple wavelengths are different and not single preselected wavelengths, the examiner notes that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., multiple wavelengths at different frequencies) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, Rees clearly meets applicant's claim to multiple wavelengths in that more than one wavelength of light is generated by the laser source, namely wavelengths 34a-34c. Although it may be that each of these wavelengths are at the same frequency, they do indeed represent the claimed "multiple" wavelengths. Given this interpretation of Rees and the claim language, the examiner notes that Rees clearly teaches the claimed multiple communication channels and the at least one detector that detects the multiple wavelengths.

In response to applicant's argument that Rees is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Rees is clearly in the field of applicant's endeavor, namely reflection and detection of free-space optical signals. Furthermore, Rees clearly discloses that the wavelengths are targeted towards and reflected from physical objects that are part of the external environment at least through disclosure of targeting and reflection from atmospheric aerosols, clouds, and the like (Figure 1). The examiner further notes that sound waves are nothing more than the vibration of aerosols or atmospheric elements, and by targeting these elements and detecting light reflected from these elements it is possible to

determine the location of storms, etc. Moreover, and given the apparent lack of criticality as to what is targeted in the claimed invention, the examiner contends that Rees' invention is also applicable to targeting trees and buildings since these too create atmospheric vibrations that would be detectable by the system of Rees. Rees also appears to suggest as much via disclosure that it is well known in the art to detect similar objects such as ships, submarines, or animals.

As to applicant's argument that none of Rees' emitted wavelengths or probe volumes can be used as communication channels, the examiner disagrees and notes that Rees' channels are clearly modulated first by the transmission modulator, then by the infrasound of the atmosphere. Through this dual modulation, a vast amount of information regarding the distance from and the nature of atmospheric disturbances is communicated to the airplane and eventually the operator of the airplane. Therefore, at least in a broad sense, the wavelengths and probe volumes of Rees can be considered as communications channels.

Next, applicant argues against the rejection of claims 6, 18 and 19. Applicant asserts that a barrier means as claimed is not taught by Rees. However, and as noted in the office action, the examiner maintains that a barrier means is clearly taught by Rees at least via disclosure of element 70 in Figure 3. Rees' element 70 in Figure 3 clearly positioned between the transmitter and receiver and prevents line-of-sight communication between the two. In other words, at no time are the transmitter laser and receiver in a direct line-of-sight relation to each other due to the use of reflector 70.

Applicant also argues that Rees' telescope does not focus light on the optical detector as claimed. However, again the examiner disagrees, and maintains that Rees clearly teaches as much. More specifically, Rees clearly discloses that light reflected from particulates in the

atmosphere from a wide field of view are collected by telescope 74 and focused towards a receiver. Given the fact that light that was once dispersed and reflected by elements in the atmosphere is then collected into what appears to be a single beam of light 76, it can be reasonably said that the light is caused to focus on the optical detector.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., separate transmitting and receiving telescopes) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). While applicant contends that claim 20 makes it clear that two separate telescopes exist, the examiner has a different opinion and interpretation of the claim language. In that opinion and interpretation, the claim language simply requires a transmitter and receiver telescope with any clear indication that the telescopes are separate and distinct. Furthermore, Rees' lightwaves are clearly reflected from the atmospheric particles. As such, the particles can be considered as the one obstacle that prevents line of sight communication being that light is reflected as opposed to being directly transmitted and received by Rees' apparatus. Rees also discloses at least one other obstacle via disclosure of mirror 70 which, as discussed above, clearly prevents line-of-sight communication between the transmitting device and the receiving device.

Regarding applicant's argument that Rees fails to specifically teach the claimed multiple telescope receivers, the examiner first notes that the cited CCD discloses exactly what is claimed. Specifically, the CCD is the receiver for the telescope and is itself comprised of millions of tiny pixels each of which is sensitive to light. Putting the above together, the CCD is interpreted as

disclosing multiple telescope receivers in that each telescope includes a CCD and this CCD is comprised of a multiple receivers.

As to applicant's argument against the rejection of claim 36, the examiner maintains that Rees teaches the claimed plurality of external remote targets at least through disclosure of reflection of light from particles in the atmosphere. The examiner also maintains that these reflections would produce multipath scatter which is then detected by Rees' apparatus. Furthermore, there being no structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art, the examiner maintains that the claimed invention is not patentably distinguished from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing as claimed, then it meets the claim. In this case, the apparatus of Rees is clearly capable of performing as claimed given that no structural difference exists between the claimed invention and the cited prior art.

Given the above, the examiner maintains that the cited prior art anticipates or obviates the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Agustin Bello whose telephone number is (571) 272-3026. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571)272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Agustin Bello/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2613